



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the War with England from 1812 to 1815, the War with Mexico, the Civil War and the recent Spanish War. The combined length of these campaigns was about ten years. Hence we see that the United States has enjoyed twelve years of peace for every year of war, while the Roman Empire enjoyed less than one year of tranquillity for every century of military engagements. I may remark in passing that at least three of these four military campaigns might have been easily averted by peaceful arbitration, and that a large share of the responsibility rests at our doors that this was not the case.

But the blessed influence of Christian civilization has been experienced not only in reducing the number of wars, but still more in mitigating the horrors of military strife. Prior to the dawn of Christianity, the motto of the conqueror was: "Woe to the vanquished." The captured cities were pillaged and laid waste. The wives and daughters of the defeated nation became the prey of the ruthless soldiery. The conquered generals and army were obliged to grace the triumphs of the victors before they were condemned to death or to ignominious bondage. Alexander the Great, after the capture of the city of Tyre, ordered two thousand of the inhabitants to be crucified, and the remainder of the population were put to death or sold into slavery. How different was the conduct of General Scott after the successful siege of the city of Mexico. As soon as the enemy surrendered not a single soldier or citizen was sacrificed to the vengeance of the victorious army, and not a single family was exiled from their native land. During the siege of Jerusalem in the year 70 of the Christian era, under Titus, the Roman General, more than a million Jews perished by the sword or by famine. Nearly one hundred thousand Jews were carried into captivity. The sacred vessels of the temple of Jerusalem were borne away by the blood-stained hands of the Roman army. Let us contrast the conduct of Titus towards the Jews with General Grant's treatment of the defeated Confederate forces. When General Lee surrendered at Appomattox Courthouse, he and his brave army were permitted to return without molestation to their respective homes. The Roman and the American General, in their opposite conduct, were reflecting the spirit of the times in which they lived. Titus, in exercising cruelty towards the vanquished, was following the traditions of paganism. Grant, in his magnanimity toward the Confederate troops, was obeying the mandates of Christian civilization.

And now, friends and advocates of international arbitration, permit me to greet you with words of good cheer and congratulation. You are engaged in the most noble and benevolent mission that can engross the attention of mankind, — a mission to which are attached the most sublime title and the most precious reward, "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God." I beg you to consider what progress has already been made in the beneficent work in which you are enlisted. A hundred years ago disputes between individuals were commonly decided by a duel. Thanks to the humanizing influence of a Christian public opinion, these disagreements are now usually adjusted by legislation or conciliation. Have we not reason to indulge the hope that the same pacific agencies which have checked the duel between individuals will, in God's own time, check the duel between nations?

In our schoolboy days, the most odious and contemptible creature we used to encounter was the bully who played the tyrant toward the weak, but cringed before his strong companions. But still more intolerable is a bullying nation that picks a quarrel with a feeble nation with the base intent of seizing her possessions. Friends and advocates of international arbitration, let it be your mission to protect the weak against the strong; and then to the ruler of a feeble nation may be applied the words of the poet:

"Thrice is he armed who hath his quarrel just."

He is armed with the consciousness of the sacred right of property. He is armed with the shield of an enlightened public opinion. He is armed with the conviction that his cause will be adjudicated by the equitable decision of a board of arbitration.

This amicable system, while protecting the rights of the weak, will not wound or humiliate the national pride of the strong, since it does not attempt to trench on the sovereignty or autonomy of the stronger power. I can recall at least four instances within the last twenty years in which international conflicts have been amicably settled by arbitration. The dispute between Germany and Spain regarding the Caroline Islands was adjusted by Pope Leo XIII in 1886. The Samoan difficulty between Germany and the United States was settled by a conference held in Berlin in 1889. A treaty of peace between the United States and Mexico was signed in Washington at the close of Cleveland's administration. And a few weeks ago a war between France and Germany — perhaps a general European conflict — was averted by the Algeciras Conference.

Let us cherish the hope that the day is not far off when the reign of the Prince of Peace will be firmly established on the earth, and the spirit of the gospel will so far sway the minds and hearts of rulers and cabinets that international disputes will be decided, not by standing armies, but by permanent courts of arbitration, — when they will be solved, not on the battlefield, but in the halls of conciliation, and will be adjusted, not by the sword, but by the pen, which "is mightier than the sword." May the nations of the earth study and take to heart this lesson, that "peace hath her victories no less renowned than war," victories more substantial and more enduring. May they learn that all schemes conceived in passion and fomented by lawless ambition are destined, like the mountain torrent, to carry terror before them, and leave ruin and desolation after them; whilst the peaceful counsels of men assembled, as you are, under the guidance of Almighty God, are sure to shed their silent blessings around them, like the gentle dew of heaven, and to bring forth abundant fruit in due season.

The United States Should Take the Lead in Limitation of Armaments.

ADDRESS OF JUSTICE DAVID J. BREWER OF THE
UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I did not intend to say anything when I came here. I came to listen and to learn; but I do move the adoption of this

platform [just presented by Dr. Gilman], although it does not come up to my desires. I believe, however, that half a loaf is better than no bread. I am used to frequent contests in a rather contentious court, in which not infrequently I find myself in a minority of four, over-ruled by what we call "a cruel majority of five." I recognize the fact that the great majority of opinion here is in favor of going as far as this platform goes, but no farther. Personally I do believe, however, in the full scope of what was said by Dr. Abbott and our President. I do believe in the wisdom of that resolution [asking Congress to defer appropriations for new warships, at least until after the second Hague Conference] offered by Mr. Paine [applause]; I believe in the wisdom of this conference taking the highest ground, and I believe the result in the long run would be beneficial.

It is said as a matter of history that when the great convention met in Chicago, before the Civil War, which ended in the nomination of Abraham Lincoln, when the effort of the leaders was to frame a platform which should not offend too much the business interests of the North, one was drafted which contained no reference to the Declaration of Independence. When it was read and presented to the convention, having been carefully prepared so as not to offend, a young Republican, a member of that convention, arose and moved that the convention endorse the Declaration of Independence . . . The influence of that act swept through the country, and Abraham Lincoln was President!

Now, there are two lines of objection to an advanced declaration in reference to the objects of this Conference, the desire for universal peace and the settlement of all disputes by arbitration. Those lines are not perhaps both represented here. One is the line of timidity and hesitation, the other is the line of business interest. There are many, as appears here, who say they believe fully in limitation of military and naval armaments, who really wish that this country would take the lead in this,—and no country is so able to take the lead and so safe in doing it as this. [Applause.] But they say that the men in charge of public affairs at Washington know the condition of things better than we do, and that if we go too far we shall offend them, and that they will fail of accomplishing anything—that it is better to move slowly and educate and crystallize public sentiment before insisting that this nation shall take the lead in the limitation of armaments, military and naval.

It has been said here by my friend, Mr. Findlay, that we have become a world-power, that Manila and Santiago led up to Portsmouth and enabled us to bring about peace between Russia and Japan. That was a fine epigrammatic statement, but I fear that it does not accord with the lessons of history. When an American laid the Atlantic cable, he joined this continent to the old continent, and the business men of this land, so magnificently represented here last night, were thereby brought into touch with those of all nations, and all nations were brought into one family, the family of nations. [Applause.] It is the tremendous accumulation of resources, the wonderful extent of our industries, that have brought all nations into the close relationship which they now sustain to us. There is where we have the power, exercised wisely and nobly by Presi-

dent Roosevelt. But the power was in the people back of him, and in the force which they had been accumulating through years and decades of commercial industry.

There is not any danger to this country. We could stop our military and naval armaments to-day with absolute safety. [Applause.] There is not a nation on the face of the globe that will attack us. If there is war between this country and a European nation, it will be because we commence it. Talk about the prowess of this nation! It was my pleasure, and perhaps that of some of you, to be present at what they called the "Last March of the Grand Army of the Republic," some six or eight years ago in Washington. The Grand Army met there and marched through Pennsylvania Avenue from the Peace Statue down in front of the White House. All day long, from early morning till night, those men marched through the streets. They carried no weapons. The Grand Army cap was the only thing that told that they had been veterans on the battlefield; and yet as they marched firmly all the livelong day, a hundred thousand strong, in front of the reviewing stand, I felt, as I never felt before, thrilled with the magnificent strength of this nation and the certainty that it was safe against the assault of every nation in the world! [Applause.] I have seen a parade of thirty thousand soldiers,—artillery, cavalry and infantry,—with all their arms and equipment; I have been in our fortifications with their immense guns moved by machinery as easily as a boy moves a toy pistol; I have been on our great ironclads and seen those wonderful engines of death,—but I never felt in my life such a sense of the power and strength of this nation as when I saw those unarmed veterans march silently down the avenue before the Chief Executive of the nation! And when to them you add those gallant soldiers who fought under Lee, and who now are loyal to the Stars and Stripes as they were to the Stars and Bars, you may be sure that no nation will attack us. When I say that I felt that sense of the power of this nation, it was not confined, that feeling, to myself alone. Many a diplomat from foreign nations, as I know, looked at that procession and felt that here was a nation that it was not safe to attack.

So I do believe that it would have been wise, if we could all have agreed in it, to have made a distinct declaration that it is the sense of this Conference that this nation should take the lead in the limitation of armaments, military and naval. If our nation would do this, we could then go before the next Hague Conference and say, "We are doing it; follow in our footsteps!" [Warm applause.]

Passing a little from that, I do think that we must realize the growing feeling in favor of peace and arbitration. The great heart of the American people beats in sympathy with that movement. It is no longer to-day a question to be settled by monarchy or parliament or by congress alone. The common people—the people upon whom Abraham Lincoln rested—are the ones who are ruling this country and will rule the world, and you may be sure that the great heart of the common people of this land beats warmly and strongly in favor of peace and arbitration, and they will stand by and support every effort in its behalf; and one day (for all

law is simply the crystallizing into force of public opinion) they will see to it that it is crystallized into the law of this nation, and with this nation into the law of the world, that disputes between the nations as between individuals shall be settled by law and by the courts, and not by force and bullets. I beg your pardon for trespassing so long. I move the adoption of this platform. [Prolonged applause.]

Work Among College Men and Women.

ADDRESS OF DR. W. H. P. FAUNCE, PRESIDENT OF BROWN UNIVERSITY.

I am very happy to follow Dr. Gilman [report on work in the universities and colleges], both because all of us who are engaged in educational work have been following him, afar off, for the last twenty-five years, and because I profoundly believe in the truth of what he has been saying, and in the ripeness of the field that he has been indicating.

In that old city where I have my home and where Mr. Smiley taught for nineteen years, while he was getting his training for international arbitration and for the holding of these conferences, we hold our commencement in the old meetinghouse that was built before the Revolution. On the records of that church you find the quaint inscription, "This meetinghouse was built for the worship of God and to hold commencements in." May we not say of this beautiful room in which we are meeting here, that it was built for the worship of God in the simple friendly service of each morning and to hold commencements in,—the commencement of many a noble aspiration, the commencement of movements for world-wide peace, the commencement of endeavor in all our States and Territories for a truly international life. I think this room was built for that purpose, and perhaps in holding these commencements we are finding the truest worship of Almighty God.

There are some reasons why this work among college men will be specially and speedily fruitful. College men—and what I say applies equally to college women—are naturally hospitable to new ideas, especially when those ideas are large ones. They love a vision. In dealing with them we are not contending with a mass of acquired prejudices; we are not contending with great vested interests, with political hopes and fears; we are dealing with natural idealists, who believe in the tomorrow, who are facing the sunrise, and who, when they see a vision, are swift and energetic in translating it into action. Looking down on five hundred young men every morning is like looking down on so many steam engines standing on the track with steam up. There is no trouble about getting them to go, especially in the Sophomore year, but the trouble is to get them to go on the right rail and move in the right direction. There is a description of old age in the book of Ecclesiastes that is very pathetic. It says "they shall be afraid of that which is high." When a man gets to be afraid of that which is high, of that which is ideal, he is in his dotage whether he be seventeen or seventy. The young man naturally loves the high; he rallies to the ideal; he is glad now and then to attempt the seemingly impossible; and that makes the college field a specially fruitful one,

I want to see the splendid energy of our young college men and women harnessed into the cause of international arbitration. As I have said here before, you know that our young men and women in the college days are getting accustomed, in all their intercollegiate debates and sports and contests of every kind, to the idea of referring all disputed points to umpires and boards of judges. The athletic field is perhaps the clearest expression of the genius and temper and character of the school or the college. There it comes right to the front. It is a student enterprise managed by the students and expresses most clearly their attitude and tone and temper. They are accustomed in every one of their contests to see every disputed point referred to judges, supposed to be impartial; and no decent college man would ever be found kicking, as they say, against the decision of an umpire. The athletic field is a training, not only in endurance and courage and loyalty, but in the principle of arbitration; it is a declaration—the entire athletic system and the intercollegiate system in general—that only he has his quarrel just who is willing to submit it to the impartial judgment of his fellows. And that applies just as truly in international affairs as in intercollegiate contests.

It is most interesting, too, that to-day the most attractive subjects in most universities are found in social and political science. There is nothing to which our students so flock as to courses in social science, in civics, in government, in international ethics and international law. We remember, all of us, how, twenty-five years ago, it was physical science with its dazzling triumphs that drew the majority of our young men; how a little later it was biology, to unravel the secrets of human life; how, still later, they turned to psychology, thinking it would explain the basis of our mental life. But to-day it is the study of the family, society, social institutions, the development of the village community, the city, the state, the nation, our international relations, international law, that is most attractive to a large percentage of our students.

But social science has no patience with the old drum and trumpet histories of the past. It finds more interest in the cabin of the peasant, in the livelihood of the farmer, carpenter and mason, more interest in the struggle and uplift of the laborer than in the man on horseback; and the modern investigator in social and political science finds far more of interest in commercial, industrial and international development than in the parade of cavalry or the clash of swords. I do not believe we shall be able to make college men take much stock in the old fallacious adage that in times of peace we must prepare for war. [Applause.] I thought that fallacy was dead long ago, but I found yesterday it was still alive here and there. I thought we had gotten long past that time. I would rather say that in time of peace we must prepare to make war impossible. What do they mean who use the old adage? They mean that when England builds a *Dreadnaught*, we must build a vessel bigger, and then that England must build a third vessel, larger and more powerful, and that then we must build a fourth still larger and more powerful than the other three. The result of such a course would be clearly preparations for war for centuries to come, practically preparations for war eternal.